REMARKS

ON

Mr. Innes's *Critical Essay*

ON THE

Ancient Inhabitants

OF

The Northern Parts of

Britain, *or* Scotland.

EDINBURGH:
Printed by THO. and WAL. RUDDIMANS, 1733.

REMARKS

ON

Mr. Innes's *Critical Eſſay on the ancient Inhabitants of the Northern Parts of* Britain, *or* Scotland.

IF we obſerve the Accounts that have been given of the Origine of the different Nations in the World, we may ſee the Authors that have tranſmitted them, as it were vying with one another, to raiſe the Settlement of their own Country to very ancient Times, and to derive themſelves from a long Pedigree of illuſtrious Predeceſſors: And it is not to be thought ſtrange, that their Readers have not been over ſcrupulous in examining nicely into the Truth or Probability of ſuch Accounts, as they thought tended much to the Honour of their Country.

At preſent it is very commendable to ſee, as in many other Countries, ſo particularly among the *Scots*, a Diſpoſition to enquire honeſtly into their Origine, and to renounce all Ac-

counts that appear fabulous, and may be found to be inconsistent with the Truth of History, how much soever these Accounts might flatter a Conceit of an honourable Descent.

In this Mr. *Innes* has remarkably distinguished himself; after having by indefatigable Pains searched into every thing which he thought could give Light into the Time of the Settlement of the *Scots* in *Britain*, and of their being first governed by *Scottish* Kings, he not regarding the Censure which he might incur from prejudicated Minds, has been bold to advance, contrary to the prevailing Opinion of his Countrymen, That their Nation came not into *Britain*, probably before the Incarnation, and that they had no King before the fifth or sixth Age after CHRIST.

The Opinion of the Author's Capacity and Integrity prompted every Body, especially the Gentlemen of his own Country to read his Essay, touching so curious and interessing a Question.

When I heard that many, who had perused his Book, declared themselves satisfied with his Performance, so that they inclined to be of his Opinion; so soon as I could find Opportunity and Leisure, I set about the reading of it, almost persuaded that I should find the like Satisfaction that others had found.

It was not without great Reluctancy and Fear of exposing my Judgment, that I ventured to say among Friends, that Mr. *Innes* appeared to me in his Essay to have suffered his honest and laudable Intention of inquiring impartially, to transport him too far; insomuch, that out of Fear of patronizing a vulgar Error, he has, without sufficient Reason determined against a received Tradition, which for any Thing he has proved to the contrary, may still be true.

My Design is not at all to enter into the Question about the Antiquity of the Settlement, and monarchical Government of the *Scots* Nation, but only to consider whether the Arguments that Mr. *Innes* makes use of to establish his Opinion, are so clear and weighty, that every unbiassed and unprejudiced

diced Mind ought to renounce the hitherto received Opinion as evidently falſe.

The Uſe of Letters not having been introduced into theſe Parts till the *Romans* had been ſettled there ſome Time, and perhaps not till Chriſtianity had been received, it is not to be expected that the *Scots* can be able to prove their Origin and Settlement by ancient written Records, near to the Time that they pretend to have been ſettled there firſt. Tradition is the only Way by which they could convey down their Hiſtory.

It muſt be own'd that Tradition cannot be depended on ſo ſafely as written Monuments: But yet it is not to be ſlighted when the Caſe does not admit of any other Proof, and there cannot be brought any good Authority to the contrary.

In ſuch Caſes on other Occaſions Mr. *Innes* himſelf ſhews and pleads for a due Regard to Tradition. When he is ſpeaking of the Chronicle of the *Picts*, *p.* 109, 110. he ſays thus, *We give it as an ancient Monument of Hiſtory---- containing the Tradition of their Settlement in* Britain, *before whom there is no Memory of any known Inhabitants in the North of* Britain, *nor any certain Epoch of their Beginning or Settlement there. But reaching up to the dark Ages of the Depth of Antiquity, they may, for what any Man can ſhew to the contrary, contend with any Nation in* Europe; *and even as to the Number of their Seventy Kings, I do not ſee but it might have been preſerved by Tradition without the Uſe of Letters.*

Why will he not make the ſame Allowance for the Tradition about the Settlement of the *Scots*? When he does not produce any poſitive Authority for a later Settlement; yea even confeſſes that there cannot be fixed any Dates or Epochs of their firſt Settlement in *Britain*. "I do not pretend, "(ſays he) *p.* 185. there can be ſettled any fixed Dates or "Epochs of the firſt Settlement of the *Scots* in *Britain*, or "indeed of any Northern Nation, before they had the Uſe

"of

" of Letters." And further he owns, That after the Uſe of Letters, the oldeſt Authors who wrote of their Settlement believed them to have been in *Britain* before the Incarnation. " *Bede*, ſays he *p.* 702. (who wrote in the eighth Age) ſeems " to have believed that the *Scots* were ſettled before the In- " carnation, not only in *Ireland*, but even in *Britain*. And " *Nennius* alſo, a *Britiſh* Writer of the ninth Age, ſeems to " place the coming of the *Scots* to *Dalriel* (the ancient Name " of their Poſſeſſions in *Britain*) about 500 Years before the " Incarnation."

But though Mr. *Innes* could not produce any Author fixing the Time of the *Scots* coming firſt into *Britain*, and acknowledges that the Time cannot be fixed; yet he thinks one may attain to the Knowledge of it by gueſſing; finding out, from the State of Affairs in the World, a proper Time when ſome People, being ſore pinched at home, might flee from their own Country, and ſeek a Refuge in theſe Northern Iſlands; and that there was ſuch a State of Affairs about the Time of the Incarnation.

P. 541. He gives an Account how it might have happened. He ſays it is probable that the People of *Scandia* and the Northern Parts of the Continent, being pinched by the *Romans* about *Auguſtus*'s Time, when they were at their Height of Empire, would try firſt to ſettle in the moſt Northern Parts of *Britain*; but being repulſed by the warlike *Caledonians*, they removed to *Ireland*.

After they had been ſome Time in *Ireland*, he allows them to have ſent a Colony to *Scotland*.

Mr. *Innes* was under a Neceſſity of beating them off from the *Scottiſh* Coaſt in their firſt Attempt: He could not bring himſelf to believe that they could remain 500 Years without Kings, and he far leſs hoped to perſuade others of it; but having confined them during ſome Ages in *Ireland*, he thought fit to bring them over at a Time that might ſuit with *Fergus* the Son of *Erc*'s beginning a Monarchy there.

This

This he imagined to be a probable Account of their coming in. Indeed he does not affirm poſitively that it was ſo: But if we are not ſatisfied with this Way, he has found an equal Probability from like Circumſtances of the People in the Northern Extremities of *Spain*, in reducing of whom *Auguſtus* found great Difficulty, that they may have come from thoſe Parts. And this Way he accounts for their being called *Scots*, becauſe the Inhabitants of theſe Parts being deſcended of the *Celtes* or *Scyths*, the *Britains* upon their firſt Appearance, from their Arms and their Manners conformable to theſe People, might give them the Name of *Scyth* or *Y-ſcot*.

They muſt be very eaſy of Belief that are ſatisfied with ſuch Accounts: May be the People of *Scandia* and other Northern Countries, being diſtreſſed by the *Romans*, about the Time of the Incarnation fled from their own Country, and tried to ſettle in the Northern Parts of *Britain*; and when they were repulſed by the Inhabitants of theſe Parts, they went to *Ireland*, and, not meeting with ſo vigorous Oppoſition there, took poſſeſſion of that Country; and after ſome Time forced their Way to *Britain*, from which they had been beaten before: Or, if you are not pleaſed with this, it may be that the People in the Northern Parts of *Spain*, being about the ſame Time very unwilling to ſubmit to *Auguſtus*, tried to ſettle in other Places, ſuch as *Ireland* and the Northern Parts of *Britain*. Can any Man, I ſay, think this a juſt Account of the firſt Settlement of the *Scots*? Mr. *Innes* does not pretend to name any Author that ſays that about that Time it did happen ſo: And even admitting that ſome of theſe oppreſſed People had at that Time retired thither, for which however he brings no Proof; yet it would not follow from thence, that never any had attempted ſuch Migrations before. *Livy*, *Book* 5. *Chap.* 34. ſays, that in the Reign of *Tarquinius Priſcus*, which was about 600 Years before CHRIST, *Ambigatus* King of the *Celtes*, finding it hard to govern the Country, by reaſon of the great Swarms of People; that he might

might caſe the Kingdom of Part of that exceſſive Multitude, ſent out two ſtrong Colonies under his Siſters Sons, *Bellovefus* and *Sigovefus*, the one towards the North, the other towards the South, to ſeek out new Habitations for themſelves. Now, I think, with at leaſt as much, if not more Reaſon, we may from this Authority ſay, that it is probable that the *Celtes*, at this Time when we are told by *Livy* they were obliged to ſeek out a new Habitation, came to ſettle in theſe Northern Iſlands 600 Years before the Incarnation. This would agree better with the common Tradition about their Settlement: And Mr. *Innes* owns, that the Northern Nations had been often diſcharging their Country of Numbers of People, with which they were overſtocked long before *Auguſtus*'s Time.

It is not my Buſineſs at preſent to determine the Queſtion about the preciſe Time of their paſſing into *Britain*; but it is plain, that the Circumſtances of Affairs in the Continent, long before *Auguſtus*'s Time, engaged the People in ſeveral Quarters to quit their own Country, and ſeek out new Habitations, where they might be more at large and at their Eaſe. Now, I would ask Mr. *Innes*, why ſome might not paſs into *Britain* when they were pinched in thoſe Days, as well as when they were ſtraitned in *Auguſtus*'s Time?

I do not believe he can offer at any ſolid Reaſon why they might not; and the only Cauſe of denying it is, that it does not ſuit with his Scheme, for the Proof of which he has brought nothing but *May-be's*.

As to the Race of Kings:

WHEREAS it has been the common Opinion in *Scotland*, that the Reign of the *Scots* Kings in *Britain* begun ſome Ages before the Incarnation, Mr. *Innes* poſitively affirms, that they had no King till the fifth or ſixth Age after CHRIST, and that *Fergus* the Son of *Erc* was their firſt King.

p. 667. He ſays thus: *All the Remains without Exce-*

ption,

ption, which we have of our ancient Hiſtories or Records, written, extracted or abridged from them; far from authoriſing Fordon's *new Scheme, do all unanimouſly contradict it, and agree that* Fergus *the Son of* Erc *was the firſt King of the* Scots *in* Britain.

Again, *p.* 679. *I dare confidently affirm, that in no genuine Writer before the Year* 1291, *and our Conteſts with* Edward I. *about* 1300, *will be found any certain Account of the firſt forty Kings, or of any ſovereign King at all of the* Scots *in* Britain *before* Fergus.

Such bold and peremptory Aſſertions are very apt to ſurpriſe a Reader, and eaſily engage his Aſſent, eſpecially coming from an Author of great Induſtry, and who has the Reputation of a Man of Candour and Integrity.

For my own part, I could hardly doubt of his bringing convincing Evidence for the Proof of what he ſo confidently aſſerted; only I thought, that to be rationally convinced, one muſt examine the Juſtneſs and Force of an Author's Arguments, and not ſubmit blindly to any Man's Authority, whatever Opinion he may have of his Learning and Honeſty.

And now after reading over his Eſſay, having weighed his Arguments with all the Attention I could uſe, I cannot ſay that I find my Expectation anſwered, nor do I ſee that he has any ways proved his Point; and theſe bold Aſſertions of his appear to be very ill founded.

For the Satisfaction of his Readers, he has annexed to his Eſſay, by way of Appendix, the ſeveral Extracts of the Records from which he has taken his Proofs.

And it is plain, that ſeveral of theſe very Abſtracts do in moſt expreſs Terms affirm, that the *Scots* were ſettled, and governed by their own Kings in *Britain* long before the Incarnation; and theſe of them that ſpeak of *Fergus* the Son of *Erc*, who reigned about 500 Years after the Incarnation, as firſt King, do not ſay in the Terms that Mr. *Innes* alledges, that he was the firſt King of the *Scottiſh* Race, or that he was

abſolutely the firſt of the *Scots* that did reign; but only the firſt that reigned beyond *Drumalban*; which does not hinder but others may have reigned before him, though in ſmaller Territories, only he was the firſt in the Series of thoſe that reigned after the Dominions were enlarged.

This will appear by conſidering the ſeveral Abſtracts in the Appendix.

Numb. I.

Is intituled, *De ſitu Albaniæ*, &c. Mr. *Innes* believes the Author of this Piece is not a *Scotſman*; therefore he does not inſiſt on the Authority of it, leſt his Countrymen ſhould except againſt a Foreigner, as not a proper Evidence. But ſince he thinks the Paſſage in this Extract to be very clear as to the Point, and becauſe it is preciſely in the ſame Terms with what is found in the Extract *Numb.* 4. which he urges as not liable to that Exception, it is fit to examine it.

The Paſſage upon which Mr. *Innes* founds his Evidence is in the 9th Paragraph, in theſe Terms: *Fergus filius Eric fuit primus qui de ſemine Chonare ſuſcepit regnum Albaniæ, i. e. à monte Drumalban uſque ad mare Hiberniæ & Inchegall*, &c. That is, *Fergus* the Son of *Eric* was the firſt who of the Seed of *Chonare* poſſeſſed the Kingdom of *Albany* (or reigned over *Albany*;) that is to ſay, from the Hill of *Brunalban* to the Sea of *Ireland* and *Inchegall*. The Kings of *Fergus*'s Seed reigned in *Brunalban* or *Brunhere* till *Alpin* Son of *Eoachal*. *Kined* Son of *Alpin*, firſt of the *Scots* reigned ſixteen Years happily in *Pictland*.

Now this Expreſſion, *Fergus the Son of Eric was the firſt who of the Seed of Chonare (a) reigned from the Hill of Brunalban*, naturally implies that ſome of the Seed of *Chonare* had reigned before *Fergus*, but that none of his Prede-

ceſſors

(a) In the authentick Genealogy of the *Scottiſh* Kings *Chonare* is reckoned the one and twentieth from *Fergus* Son of *Ferchar*.

ceſſors had enjoyed ſo large Territories. This Senſe is confirmed from the Author's Manner of writing: For it follows immediately, "The Seed of *Fergus* reigned there *(i. e.* from "*Brunalban* to *Inchegall)* till *Alpin*, whoſe Son reigned in "*Pictland*;" which in other Terms is, "*Kined* the Son "of *Alpin* was the firſt of the *Scots* who of the Seed of *Fer*-"*gus* reigned in *Pictland*." As this implies that there were of the Seed of *Fergus* that reigned before *Kined*, though *Kined* was the firſt that reigned in *Pictland*; ſo in like manner the other Expreſſion implies, that there were of the Seed of *Chonare* who had reigned before *Fergus*, but *Fergus* was the firſt who reigned after the Kingdom was enlarged, and reached from *Brunalban* to *Inchegall*.

From what precedes in this Extract, the Author ſeems to ſay, that the Kingdom before *Fergus* was confined to *Argile*. He tells that *Albania* was divided by ſeven Brothers into ſeven Kingdoms; in the 7th Paragraph he ſays the ſeventh Kingdom was *Argile*. And that he meant that this was the Kingdom of the *Scots*, appears from what he ſays in the 8th Paragraph, that it is called *Argathelia* or *Arregathel*, as if one ſaid *Margo Scotorum*, the March or Bounds of the *Scots*; becauſe (as he adds) all the *Iriſh* and *Scots* were called *Gatheili*, as deſcending from *Gaithilglas*. Then in the ſame Paragraph he ſays the *Scots* dwelt there at firſt after their Return from *Ireland*. By the by, what he ſays of their Return from *Ireland* ſeems to favour *Fordon*'s Scheme, as Mr. *Innes* calls it.

So that this Extract is far from proving, ſo clearly as Mr. *Innes* alledges, that *Fergus* the Son of *Erc* was abſolutely the firſt of the *Scottiſh* Race that reigned in any Part of *Britain*.

By no Rule of Speech can one from this Expreſſion, *Fergus the Son of Erc was the firſt who of the Seed of Chonare reigned in Albany*, i. e. *from the Hill of Drumalban*, infer that this *Fergus* was abſolutely the firſt that reigned in *Alba-*

ny; no more than what follows in the ſame Paragraph, *Kined the Son of Alpin firſt of the Scots reigned in Pictland*, can ſignify that the *Scots* had no King before *Kined*; or, if we ſhould ſay, *James the Son of Mary was the firſt who of the Race of Stuarts reigned in England*, one could conclude, that none of the *Stuarts* had reigned any where before *James*.

NUMB. II.

Contains only a Catalogue of the Kings of the *Picts*.

NUMB. III.

Is a ſhort Account of twelve Kings from the uniting of the Kingdom of the *Picts*.

It begins, "*Kined* firſt of the *Scots* ruled happily that "*Pictland*."

This ſhews our Hiſtories diſtinguiſhed the Reigns of the Kings into ſeveral Periods; and in reckoning, they called him who ſtood in the Beginning of the Series the *firſt*, but underſtood it only *firſt* of that Series. As here *Kined* is called *firſt* of the *Scots*, but the Meaning is only of thoſe that ruled *Pictland*; the Authors did not apprehend, that their Readers were in any hazard of miſtaking their Meaning, when they had determined the Epocha: So in other Extracts, when *Fergus* the Son of *Erc* is called *firſt*, the Meaning is only, *firſt* in the Series of thoſe that reigned beyond *Brunalban*, or (as one may collect from the firſt Extract) of thoſe that reigned after the *Scots* returned from *Ireland*. This does not hinder but there might be, but rather implies that there were (as has been commonly believed) ſtill other Kings that preceded them.

NUMB. IV.

The Title of this Extract is, *Chronicles of* Scots *Kings for* 314 *Years*. No

No body will ſay that this Title promiſes a complete Liſt of the *Scots* Kings, or that it is neceſſarily to be underſtood of the firſt 314 Years that they reigned, although Mr. *Innes* reckons that it is ſo: And he thinks that his Aſſertion about the Beginning of the *Scottiſh* Monarchy is clearly proved from the firſt Words of the Extract.

It begins, ſays he, with theſe Words, "That *Fergus* the "Son of *Erc* was the firſt of the *Scottiſh* Race; that he reign-"ed from *Drumalban* to *Inchegall (a)*."

The Author ſays indeed, "That he was the firſt that reign-"ed from *Drumalban*;" but not, "That he was the *firſt* "of the *Scottiſh* Race."

The Extract begins preciſely in theſe Terms, "*Fergus* the "Son of *Erc* was the firſt who of the Seed of *Chonare* took "poſſeſſion of (or reigned in) the Kingdom of *Albany*, *i. e.* "from the Hill of *Drumalban* to the Sea of *Ireland* and "*Inchegall*."

I am unwilling to ſuſpect Mr. *Innes*'s Candour, but at leaſt his want of Attention cannot be excuſed. I will appeal to himſelf, if there is not a great Difference between theſe two Expreſſions, "*Fergus* the Son of *Erc* was the firſt of the "*Scottiſh* Race; he reigned from *Drumalban* to *Inchegall*," which is the Way he repreſents it, and the Terms of the Author, which are, "*Fergus* the Son of *Erc* was the firſt who "reigned from *Drumalban* to *Inchegall*;" juſt as there is between theſe two, "*Kined* was the firſt of the *Scots* who "reigned in *Pictland*," and, "*Kined* was the firſt of the "*Scots* Race; he reigned in *Pictland*."

The Words in this Extract being exactly the ſame with thoſe in the firſt, of the Situation of *Albany*, it is needleſs to repete what was ſaid there.

But it is remarkable, that as the Title of this Extract did not promiſe a complete Liſt of *Scottiſh* Kings, but only a Chronicle

(*a*) In the Copy which I read, it is preciſely thus in *Engliſh*; whereas in theſe that I have ſeen ſince, Mr. *Innes* has ſet down the Words in *Latin*, as they are in the Extracts.

Chronicle of *Scottiſh* Kings for 314 Years, which is the Space of Time from *Fergus* the Son of *Erc*, who reigned firſt from *Drumalban* to *Inchegall*, till *Kined* the Son of *Alpin*; ſo the Author takes notice, that from *Kined* to the firſt Year of *William* the 49th King from *Fergus* Son of *Erc*, it is 315 Years. And to let ſee that theſe two Periods, from *Fergus* Son of *Erc* to *Kined*, and from *Kined* to *William*, do not contain the whole Race of the *Scottiſh* Kings; when he has carried back the Genealogy from *William* to *Kined*, and from *Kined* to *Fergus* Son of *Erc*, he ſtill goes on from this *Fergus* to the other *Fergus*; or, (as he is called there) *Forgo* Son of *Feradaigh*, &c. I know Mr. *Innes* will ſay, that this is only the Genealogy of the Family, and that none of them before *Fergus* the Son of *Erc* were Kings; but for any thing that is ſaid to the contrary by that Extract, they may have been Kings: When they come up to *Fergus* the Son of *Erc*, they do not diſtinguiſh and ſay that the Kings went no furrher, and that what precedes is only the Genealogy of a private Family, from which *Fergus* was deſcended.

'Tis true the Genealogy here is carried up to *Simon Briſt*, but the common Accounts go no further than *Fergus* Son of *Ferchar*. *Fordon* and others that have ſearched into the Remains of our Hiſtory give up the reſt as fabulous, or at leaſt not concerned in the Royal Line: And Mr. *Innes* confeſſes, (as ſhall be ſhown afterwards) that the *Engliſh*, *Iriſh*, and *Scottiſh* Writers in all Ages, *South*, *North*, and *Highlands*, do agree in the Genealogy from that *Fergus*.

But it is not much to be wondred at, that Mr. *Innes* ſhould think that theſe Extracts prove that *Fergus* the Son of *Erc* was the firſt King of the *Scots* Race, ſince they begin with him, and do not expreſly make Mention that there were any that preceded him. His Zeal to eſtabliſh this Point, makes him find it, even in Authors that employ whole Treatiſes to prove that they had Kings of their own, long before the Incarnation; accordingly he brings *Fordon* himſelf as his fourth

Evi-

Evidence, to prove that *Fergus* the Son of *Erc* was the firſt King of the *Scottiſh* Race; notwithſtanding that he confeſſes that *Fordon*, throughout his ſecond Book, endeavours to ſhew that the Monarchy began under *Fergus* the Son of *Ferchar*, and that between this *Fergus* and the other who reigned in the 5th or 6th Age, there interveened 45 Kings. He ſays indeed, *p.* 672. *This may appear a ſtrange Parodox*, yet he does not doubt to make it out; in order to which, he ſays, in theſe Terms, *p.* 673. "*John Fordon*, in "his Searches for Memorials of our Hiſtory, had no Doubt "ſeen theſe Abſtracts of our ancient Chronicles I have quoted above, or others equivalent, and read in them the "Words I ſet down, *viz.* That *Fergus* Son of *Erc* was the "firſt King of the *Scottiſh* Race; that he reigned from "*Drumalban* to *Inchegal*; and that he reigned only three "Years; which are the Words of the Extracts above-mentioned; but if they be let paſs without a Commentary, "and be taken in their literal Meaning, they are enough to "ſubvert the whole Fabrick of *Fordon*'s 45 Kings before "*Fergus* the Son of *Erc*, &c.

The Subſtance of what follows, is; That to avoid that Inconveniency *Fordon* ſuppoſes a Subverſion of the Monarchy, and a Reſtoration of it under *Fergus* the Son of *Erc*, and that he reigned ſixteen Years, and in the three laſt he reigned beyond *Drumalban* in the Country of the *Picts*, from the Hills to the *Scottiſh* Seas; but that this Gloſs, after all the Pains he has taken, cannot hide the Conformity of his Expreſſions, with what is ſaid in the Extracts; and that it will appear to any unprejudiced Reader, that he agrees with them.

Then he ſubjoins *Fordon*'s Words, *Ferguſius rex* [*ſedecim annis*] *regnavit in Scotia* [*quorum tribus ultimis*] *ultra Dennalban, hoc eſt, ultra dorſum Albaniæ primus regum Scotici generis* [*in terra Pictorum*] *à montibus ad mare* [*Scoticum.*] What is incloſed within the Crotchets he calls *For-*

Fordon's Interpolations, to adapt what he has found recorded about *Fergus* to his own Syſtem.

This is all the Proof he brings of *Fordon*'s being on his Side. He ſays, "That even while he is endeavouring to "eſtabliſh an oppoſite Scheme, he has inadvertently blabbed "out the Truth, and let ſuch Expreſſions eſcape from "him as agree with the other Extracts, and entirely over-"throw his own Scheme."

Mr. *Innes* muſt pardon his Reader, if he does not think himſelf obliged to take things barely on his Word, nor without Examination, to aſſent to whatever he has boldly and peremptorily aſſerted.

It is indeed very probable that *Fordon* did ſee theſe ancient Extracts which Mr. *Innes* quotes in his Eſſay. which he has annexed by Way of Appendix to it: But it is very certain, that he did not read in them the Words which Mr. *Innes* ſets down, *viz. That* Fergus *the Son of* Erc *was the firſt King of the* Scottiſh *Race*; *that he reigned from* Drumalbayn *to* Inchegal, *and that he reigned only three Years*: And unleſs Mr *Innes* has ſeen other Extracts than theſe in the Appendix, I may confidently ſay, that he himſelf did not ſee them; for theſe Words, Fergus *the Son of* Erc *was the firſt King of the* Scottiſh *Race*, are not in theſe Extracts, but theſe, Fergus *the Son of* Erc *was the firſt who of the Seed of* Chonare *reigned in* Albany, *from the Hill of* Brunalban, *to the Sea of* Ireland *and* Inchegal. Neither is it ſaid in any of theſe Extracts, that he reigned *only* three Years, but that he reigned three Years beyond *Drumalban*.

And this does not at all contradict what *Fordon* ſays of *Fergus* Son of *Erc*'s reigning ſixteen Years. The Extracts take only Notice of the Space that he reigned beyond *Brunalban*; whereas *Fordon* gives the full Number of Years of his Reign, and tells, that he reigned only the three laſt beyond *Dennalban* or *Brunalban*.

In like Manner we ſee the Extracts, *Numb*. 3, *Numb*. 4. and

and *Numb.* 5. ſay that *Kined* reigned ſixteen Years; but it appears they mean only the Time that he reigned in *Pictland*; for notwithſtanding of reckoning ſo in the Extract, *Numb.* 3. it is ſaid that he reigned two Years in *Dalrieta* before he came to *Pictland:* And in the Extract, *Numb.* 6. in *chap.* 6. which contains a Chronology from *Fergus* the Son of *Erc*, it is ſaid of *Kined*, that he reigned ſeven Years; but that this is to be underſtood only of the Time that he reigned in his ancient Territories, is plain from what is ſaid *chap.* 7th, "*Kined*, after he had beat out, or entirely put "to flight the *Picts*, he continued to reign twice eight "Years."

Tho' Mr. *Innes* met with no Extracts that mentioned more than three Years of *Fergus*'s Reign, *Fordon* may have met with Records from which he learned that he had reigned thirteen Years before he got into the Country of the *Picts*, and that he reigned three Years after that.

Mr. *Innes* in his Eſſay, *p.* 145. ſays, "It is not to be "doubted but *Fordon* or ſuch others of our Writers that "wrote after him in the 14th or 15th Age, had before them "more ancient Hiſtories, which might have afforded greater "Light into the *Britiſh* Affairs.

NUMB. V.

The Title of this Extract is *firſt* in general, *Names of Scottiſh and Pictiſh Kings. Next, A Series of Scottiſh Kings*; (which is only of a certain Number of Kings, and for a certain Time, as appears plainly from what follows in the Title) *An Account of* 23 *Kings in* 327 *Years,* 3 *Months.* And then is ſubjoined a Liſt of the Kings from *Fergus* the Son of *Erc* to *Alpin*. This evidently is only the Series of the Kings that reigned after the Dominions were extended beyond *Drumalban*, till they conquered *Pictland*.

After this Series follows a new Title, *viz. Names of Pictiſh Kings*; to which is ſubjoined a Catalogue of the Kings of the *Picts*.

After the Catalogue of *Pictiſh* Kings, follows a new Series of *Scottiſh* Kings from a new Epocha, *viz.* from the uniting of *PictLand*: It begins from *Kined*, and is carried down to *Alexander* III.

Now the Terms of theſe Titles do not promiſe a complete Liſt of all the *Scottiſh* Kings, but only of certain Epocha's; and one cannot infer from hence, that there were none that preceeded theſe that are ſet down here. And the Words with which this Extract begins, *viz. Fergus the Son of Erc firſt reigned in Scotland beyond Drumalban*, lead one naturally to think what *Fordon* has added to the Paſſage quoted above, *That none of his Predeceſſors had been Maſter ſo far before him*. He ſays indeed, as Mr. *Innes* obſerves, That he has not diſcovered whether they came to poſſeſs it by the Sword, or any other Way: But that ſays nothing to favour Mr. *Innes*'s Syſtem.

Numb. VI.

This Extract contains a ſhort *Scottiſh* Chronicle in Latin in Rhyme. The Title of it is, *Breve chronicon Scoticum, ſive chronicon Rythmicum*:

There is indeed ſomething in this Chronicle, which at firſt Sight ſeems to favour the Opinion of *Fergus* the Son of *Erc*, being the firſt of the *Scottiſh* Race that reigned in *Britain*; for in the 5th Chapter it is ſaid, "That the *Scots*, tho' they "were in *Britain* before the Incarnation, yet they lived a "long Time according to the Law of Nature, without a "King, till one called *Fergus* brought the famous Stone to "*Argyle*, (*Argadia*) and became the firſt King of the *Scots*." Mr. *Innes* takes this *Fergus* to be the Son of *Erc*. Let it be taken for granted that the Author meant him, tho' *Fordon* ſays

ſays, *l.* 2. *c.* 12. That *Fergus* the Son of *Ferchard* brought over the fatal Stone.

It muſt be own'd that the Title *firſt* given to the Son of *Erc*, does not appear to be reſtrained here, or qualified, as it is in the other Extracts.

But either the Author could not mean here that *Fergus* who reigned in the fifth or ſixth Age: (In ſome of the Extracts the other *Fergus* is likewiſe called Son of *Erc*;) or, if he meant him, he did not underſtand that he was abſolutely the firſt that reigned in *Scotland*; for in the 4. *chap.* he ſays, the *Scots* came into *Scotland* 443 Years before CHRIST. Now it is hardly to be ſuppoſed that he would ſay they lived above 900 Years according to the Law of Nature, without a King, eſpecially if we conſider, that he ſays in the Preface to his Chronicle, that the *Scots* reigned before the *Picts*; and every Body allows that the *Picts* reigned long before the fifth Age. And Mr. *Innes* himſelf owns, that this Expreſſion ought not to be taken ſtrictly. Speaking of the *Scots* coming in under *Eoacha Riada*, in the third Age, *p.* 664. he ſays thus, "It is at leaſt very probable they continued and made a Fi-
"gure in the fourth and fifth Ages--- and it is no ways like-
"ly that they could have ſubſiſted without ſome Government
"of their own,—— nor without Leaders or Chiefs;—— and
"I do not ſee why theſe Leaders or Chiefs of the *Scots* in
"*Britain* might not be called Kings, as well as ſome of theſe
"of *Ireland*, to whom that Title is given, or even as ſome of
"theſe in *England* during the Heptarchy, or theſe of the
"*Britains* or *Welſh* in *Wales*, or in the *Weſt* of *Scotland*:
"So that the Expreſſion we will find in the Latin Chronicle
"in Metre, *(N. B.)* That the *Scots* in *Britain* till the Time
"of *Erc* lived without a King, cannot regularly be taken in
"the Rigour of the Letter, as if abſolutely they had not
"ſuch leſſer Kings, as there were many in *Ireland*;—— but
"that the *Scots* before the Time of *Erc* had no Sovereign
"King over all the *Scottiſh* Inhabitants of *Britain*, ſuch as
"*Fergus* the Son of *Erc* and his Succeſſors were.

Does not this Explication of Mr. *Innes* juſtify the Obſervation, that what is ſaid of *Fergus* Son of *Erc*, in the Extracts quotted by him, is not to be underſtood as if they meant that he was abſolutely the firſt of the *Scots* that had reigned in *Britain*, but the firſt that had reigned over the *Scots*, after their Dominions were enlarged, *i. e.* from *Drumalban* to *Inchegal*.

But there is another Paſſage in this *Chronicon Rythmicum*, which Mr. *Innes* thinks an additional and irrefragable Proof of *Fergus* the Son of *Erc*'s being abſolutely the firſt King of the *Scots*; it is the Time the *Scots* are ſaid to have reigned together with the *Picts*, which he ſays is 332, or 312 Years; according to a diffetent Reading, it being in ſome Copies *quater octoque*, that is, and eight four Times, *i. e.* 32; in others it is, *quatuor octoque*, that is, four and eight, *i. e.* 12. Now this Number of Years will not reach further than *Fergus* the Son of *Erc*, who reigned in the fifth or ſixth Age; whereas *Fergus* I. is ſuppoſed to have lived 330 Years before CHRIST; that is, near 1200 Years before the Union of the *Scots* with the *Picts*. The Words in the Extract are,

Hi cum prædictis regnarunt tempore Pictis,
Quod trecentenos quater octoque continet annos.

Mr. *Innes*, to adapt this to his Scheme, interpolates *Scoti* before *hi*, as if the Author was ſpeaking of the Reign of all the *Scottiſh* Kings.

This Interpolation of Mr. *Innes*'s, together with the ambiguous Way of the Author's expreſſing himſelf, led me, when I conſidered theſe Lines ſeparately, to diſtinguiſh the ſecond Line thus, *Trecentenos quater, octoque*, Three hundred four times and eight: This appeared the moſt natural and eaſy way of diſtinguiſhing; and this Way it gives the Time that Mr. *Innes* ſays is required to reach to *Fergus* I. and then the Author, who ſays that the *Scots* reigned before the Incarnation,

tion, would be conſiſtent with himſelf; whereas if he is ſpeaking of the whole Time of the *Scots* Reign, according to the other Way of diſtinguiſhing, he flatly contradicts himſelf.

Mr. *Innes*, in his Note on the 2d Verſe of the 4th Chapter of this *Chronicon*, ſays thus *p.* 809. "Indeed, from the "whole Context of this and the preceding Chapter, it ap- "pears by theſe Verſes, *Bis bis centeno*, &c. that the Au- "thor was of Opinion, that the *Scots* began to inhabit in "*Britain* 443 Years before the Incarnation, and that they "were ſettled in this Iſland before the coming of the *Picts*, "whom both this Author and all other *Scottiſh* Writers be- "lieve to have come into the Country at leaſt 200 Years be- "fore CHRIST."

He ſays the ſame thing *p.* 703. when he is refuting *Bede*'s Interpretation of theſe Lines, *Bis bis centeno*, &c.

And the Author of the *Chronicon*, in the Preface, ſays expreſly he will give an Account how long the *Scottiſh* Kings reigned before the *Picts*, how long they reigned with them, and how long after them.

Thus it is undeniable, that this Author believed that the *Scots* were ſettled in *Britain* under Kingly Government before the Incarnation.

But to ſpeak ingenuouſly, when I turned over to the Extract, and read it at length, I was ſatisfied that this Paſſage ought to be underſtood 332 or 312: But then it is to be obſerved, that he does not ſay that the *Scots*, as Mr. *Innes* has interpolated it, (meaning all the *Scots* Kings) but only *theſe*, reckoning up them that he had named, who had reigned from *Fergus* the Son of *Erc* to *Kined*, which is the ſame Series with what is contained in the 5th Extract, under the Title of, *An Account of twenty three Kings in 327 Years; that is, from* Fergus *Son of* Erc *to* Alpin *the Father of* Kined.

And this does not prove that this 332 or 312 Years is the whole Time that there were Kings that reigned in *Scotland* with the *Picts*, no more than the like Expreſſion in the 4th

Extract,

Extract, when having reckoned thoſe that had reigned from *Kined* to *William*, the Author ſays, " From the firſt Year " of *William* the Years of the *Scottiſh* Kings are 315."

Beſides the Extracts in the Appendix, Mr. *Innes* brings as a further Proof an Extract written by *James Gray*. I know not how he comes to make uſe of this as a new Proof, ſince *p.* 671. he owns it is only a Copy of the Regiſter of the Priory of St. *Andrew*'s, which he produced before as one of his Evidences. Now a hundred Copies of the ſame Record are ſtill but the ſame Evidence over and over again.

But it may ſtill ſeem more ſtrange, and in a manner a Paradox, that he ſhould adduce *James Gray* as a Witneſs, when he is directly againſt him; for from him it is plain, that the Catalogue in that Liſt does not contain a complete Liſt of the *Scottiſh* Kings, but only the Series of thoſe that had reigned after the Dominions were extended beyond *Drumalban*, or, as he calls it, *Druthin-alban*.

To prevent any body's thinking otherwiſe, before he ſets down the Account of theſe Kings, he cautions his Readers to remember that the Kingdom of the *Scots* begun before the Incarnation: *Notandum quòd regnum Scotiæ incepit ante incarnationem.*

Mr. *Innes* ſays, that the Reaſon of that *Notandum* is, becauſe Mr. *Gray* had ſeen *Fordon*'s Hiſtory, and was preven'd by the common Notions that the *Scots* had in his Days, of *Fergus* the Son of *Ferchard* being the firſt King, and Founder of the Monarchy; but that being a publick Notary, he cauſed to be tranſcribed faithfully the Account of the Succeſſion of our Kings, ſuch as he found it in ancient Records, however oppoſite it was to his own and the common Opinion of the *Scots* in theſe Days.

No doubt *James Gray* tranſcribed it faithfully; but he had not the ſame Notion of it as Mr. *Innes*: He thought it no ways oppoſite to his own and his Countrymens Opinion about the Royal Government in *Scotland*; he look'd upon it as

as only a partial Liſt of the *Scottiſh* Kings, from the Time that *Fergus* extended their Dominions, or, as *Fordon* has it, from the Reſtoration of the Monarchy; there is not the leaſt Inſinuation that he thought it inconſiſtent with his *Notandum*.

Numb. VII.

Is an Extract of the Chronicle of *Andrew Winton* Prior of *Lochleven*.

The Argument that Mr. *Innes* brings from this Chronicle is, That Mr. *Winton*, though amongſt the reſt of the Names of the Predeceſſors of our Kings he reckons *Fergus* the Son of *Ferchar*, yet he takes no particular notice of him, nor in the leaſt inſinuates his having been the firſt King, or a King of the *Scots* at all; whereas when he comes down to *Fergus* Son of *Erc*, he calls him expreſly the firſt King of the *Scots*, and alſo in the Review by himſelf of his Chronicle he perſiſts in it; and according to the Records of St. *Andrew*'s, (and he does not doubt but he had it from them) informs us that *Fergus* Son of *Erc*, firſt King of the *Scots*, reigned three Years from *Drumalban* to *Inchegall*.

This is no ways a fair Account of *Winton*'s Chronicle. Mr. *Innes*, *p.* 684. endeavouring to prove his Scheme of *Fergus*, that reigned in the fifth or Beginning of the ſixth Age, being the firſt King of the *Scots*, from a Tradition among the *Scots* of their Monarchy beginning by one *Erc* or the Son of *Erc*, tells that the Inſtructions given to their Commiſſioners at *Rome*, *A. D.* 1300, during the Debate with King *Edward* before the Pope, ſpeak of two *Ercs*, one that reigned before the Incarnation, and another in the fourth or fifth Age. When *Winton* calls *Fergus* the Son of *Erc*, or *Erthſon*, the firſt King (abſolutely) of the *Scots*, he certainly does not mean that *Fergus* that lived in the fifth or ſixth Age; for he ſays of him that he reigned before the *Picts*. His Words are:

Fergus

Fergus Erthſon *the firſt Man*
Was yat in our Land began,
Before that Time yat the Peythis
Our Kinrik wan fra the Scottis, &c. p. 821.

And in his Chronicle reviewed by himſelf, when he comes to ſpeak of *Fergus* that reigned in the fifth or ſixth Age, there is not ſo much as the Word *firſt*, but only that he reigned three Years from *Drumalban* to *Stanemore*.

Mr. *Innes* ſaw very well (though it made for his Purpoſe to diſſemble it) that *Winton* ſpeaks of two Kings of the Name of *Fergus*, between whoſe Reigns there intervened a great Diſtance of Time: For he obſerves him to be mightily embaraſſed, how to reconcile the great Diſtance of Time from *Fergus Erthſon* to *Kenaught Macalpin*, which is above 1200 Years, with the ſmall Number of Generations that are reckoned between them, which are but ten or eleven. Mr. *Innes*, after he has repreſented the Intricacy of that Account, *p.* 626. ſays thus: "*Winton* himſelf had obſerved this in the firſt "Draughts of his Chronicle, and after uſeleſs Efforts to get "rid of it, he is at laſt forced to leave it to others, or rather "to give it up, and to own that the *Picts* were already reigning in *Albany*, before *Fergus Mac-Erch* firſt King of the "*Scots* began to reign. It ſeems that *Winton* was adviſed "to omit all this in the laſt Review and Correction of his "Chronicle, where accordingly we meet no more with it." And *p.* 682. he ſays, "At laſt finding it impoſſible to make "ten or eleven Generations in thoſe Times fill up 1200 Years, "he chuſes rather to bring down the Beginning of the *Scottiſh* Monarchy to more modern Times, and to grant that "the *Picts* were already ſettled in *Britain* when the *Scots* "came into it, and doubts no more of *Fergus* the Son of "*Erc* being their firſt King."

Let one judge whether this is a juſt Account, by the Words of the Extract reviewed by himſelf, which are as follows.

Four

Four hundred Winters and fifty,
And twa to reckyn our even likely,
Before the Nativite, &c.
As in our Story written is,
Yan in Scotland *the* Scottis
Begouth to reign and to ſteir,
Twa hundred full and forty Zhere,
Five Winters and Monethis three
Or the Peythis *in* Scotland
Came in, and in it were dwelland.
And now to thai I turn my Style,
Of their Lynage to ſpeke a while:
As in the third Book was before,
From Simon Brek *till* Fergus More,
Is as the Scottis *lynally*
Come down of Iriſhery;
Quhar yen I left, now to begin,
Fair Namis here I will tak in.
He yat was callet Fergus More,
In ye third Buke ze hard before,
Was Fergus Erthſon, *that thre Zhere*
Made him beyond ye Drum *to ſteir,*
Oure all ye Hychtis evir ilkane,
As yai ly fra Drumalbane
Till Stanemore *and* Inchegall,
King he made him oure yaim all.

I cannot poſſibly imagine, how Mr. *Innes* can from this Extract reviewed infer, that *Winton* diſclaims his former Opinion of the Antiquity of the *Scottiſh* Monarchy. Does he not ſay in the plaineſt Terms, that the *Scots* began to reign 452 Years before the Incarnation, and 245 Years three Months before the *Picts*? And as to *Fergus Erthſon*, does he ſay that he was the firſt King of the *Scots*? So far from it, that

where he is ſpeaking of him, the Word *firſt* is not to be found at all; all that he ſays of him is, that he reigned beyond the *Drum*, over all the Country from *Drumalbane* to *Stanemore* and *Inchegall*.

Beſides the Authority of theſe Extracts, Mr. *Innes*, *p.* 684. endeavours to eſtabliſh his Scheme from the Inſtructions which the *Scots* ſent to their Commiſſioners at *Rome A. D.* 1300, during the Debate with King *Edward* before the Pope. He ſays, from theſe Inſtructions it appears that the Tradition of the *Scottiſh* Monarchy beginning by one *Erc* was deeply rooted in the Minds of the *Scots*; 1. from their deriving from *Erc* and *Gatheyl* the Name of their firſt Settlement in *Britain*; 2. from their naming no other King of *Scots* but *Erc*, whom they bring in both the firſt King of the *Scots* in *Britain* in the higheſt Antiquity, and again as a King of the *Scots* about the End of the fourth or Beginning of the fifth Age, where our Moderns (ſays he) place the Reſtoration of the Monarchy.

This Opinion of one *Erc*'s being the Founder of the *Scottiſh* Monarchy, is no ways an Argument againſt the Antiquity of it. Mr. *Innes* owns, that the Inſtructions ſpeak of two *Ercs*, one that reigned before the Incarnation, and another in the fourth or fifth Age: and I believe that thoſe that plead for the Antiquity of the Royal Line, will not be much concerned whether the Name of the Father of the firſt *Fergus* was *Ferchar* or *Erc*, which is alſo the Name of the Father of the ſecond *Fergus*: And to do Mr. *Innes* Juſtice, he does not ſeem to lay much Weight on this; he only ſays it is worth obſerving.

I would not have it to be thought, that I am contending for the higheſt Antiquity of the Settlement of the *Scots* in *Britain*, or of the Race of the *Scottiſh* Kings; I have ſtudied to avoid entring into that Queſtion: Nor do I indeed think that the Honour of the Nation, or of the Royal Family, is much concerned in it. Suppoſing they had no Kings before

the

the ſifth or ſixth Age, they may vye with the eldeſt Royal Families in *Europe*. If there can be offered good Reaſons, by which it may clearly appear that this is the Time about which they began to be ſettled, we ought no longer to ſtruggle for an Opinion that is contrary to the Truth of Hiſtory, out of a vain Notion of Honour to the Country; though on the other hand, unleſs there can be brought ſufficient Arguments againſt the common Opinion, it would be ungenerous, as well as unjuſt, to ſacrifice the Memory, or do any thing in prejudice of the Honour of theſe Perſons, that an uninterrupted Tradition has repreſented as the Founders and Supporters of their Country.

Fordon ſurely was not the firſt that gave riſe to that Opinion of forty Kings: Mr. *Innes* owns, that while our ancient Records or Hiſtories were yet entire, they agreed in a Genealogy of our Kings, in which theſe forty that preceded *Fergus* the Son of *Erc* are diſtinctly reckoned. While he is endeavouring to diſcredit *Boece*'s Hiſtory, he thinks it a clear Proof that the Authors upon whoſe Authority he reports Things, were forged, becauſe the Names they give of their Kings differ exceedingly from thoſe in the authentick Genealogy, in which all our Writers before that Time do agree.

Of which Agreement he ſays thus, *p.* 236. "In the twelfth "Age the Author of the Genealogy in the MS. intituled *Chro-*"*nica Regum Scotorum*, ſet down in the Appendix *Numb.* "4. who was a *Scottiſh* Writer, and *Radulphus de Diceto*, "Dean of *London*, an *Engliſh* Writer, relate both of them "this Genealogy as it is ſet down by *Fordon*."

And *p.* 237. "In the thirteenth Age (ſays he) the High-"land *Seanachy* or Antiquary, mentioned by all *Fordon*'s "Continuators, and by *Major*, pronounced this Genealogy "in the ſame Series of Names from *Fergus* Son of *Erc* to "*Fergus* Son of *Ferchar* and upwards, at the Coronation "of King *Alexander* III. *A. D.* 1249; and this being on "ſo ſolemn an Occaſion, in preſence of the three Eſtates of

" the Kingdom assembled for the Coronation, carries with it " the Sense of the whole Kingdom, especially that of all " Highland *Seanachies*, so well versed in, and so tenacious " of the ancient Genealogies; and this while our ancient Re- " cords were as yet entire, and before they were destroyed " by *Edward* I."

p. 238. " *Fordon*, after all his Travels and Searches, in- " serts this in his Chronicle, as being the authentick Genea- " logy of our Kings, and conform to what he had met with " every where else."

p. 239. " Thus we see, besides the *English* Account of " that Genealogy, the same as ours, and the *Irish*, which " differs only in four or five Names, the *Scottish* Writers in " all Ages, South, North and Highlands, the Writers of the " Clergy and those of Monasteries, all agree without Exce- " ption (allowing for the Faults of Transcribers) on the same " Names and Series of the Genealogy from *Fergus* the Son " of *Ferchar*, called *Fergus* I. to *Fergus* II. Son of *Erc*."

Thus Mr. *Innes* allows the Genealogy to be authentick, but he will by no means allow any preceding *Fergus* Son of *Erc* in that Genealogy to have been Kings. I have no mind to dispute it with him, though it is not easy to imagine a good Reason why there should have been such Care taken to preserve their Memory, and to rank them in the Catalogue of their Kings, and that without any Mark of Distinction, at the Coronation, if they were not Kings.

It is at least a Proof, that the Persons there named were considerable for the Power and Credit they had among the People; and no great Matter whether you call them *Leaders*, or *Chiefs*, or *little Kings*.

And unless we see better Reasons than Mr. *Innes* has offered, I think it would be rash to pronounce certainly that they were not Kings, contrary to the received Opinion.

I think it evident to a demonstration, that these Extracts upon which he founds his Opinion (and if he had had any clear-

er,

er, no doubt he would have produced them) are not to be underſtood, as if they meant that *Fergus* Son of *Erc* was abſolutely the firſt King of the *Scots*: Is it poſſible that theſe who ſay expreſly that the *Scottiſh* Monarchy begun before the Incarnation, that it was more ancient than the *Picts*, (as the *Breve Chronicon*, *Winton* and *Andrew Gray* moſt expreſly affirm) ſhould mean that *Fergus* Son of *Erc*, who did not live till ſeveral Ages after CHRIST, was the firſt King that had reigned in *Scotland*? Without their aſſerting a more ancient Monarchy in plain Terms, I believe few will deny but that Expreſſion, *Fergus was the firſt that reigned beyond Drumalban*, implies that others had reigned before him, though in ſmaller Territories.

And this Senſe of the Words is ſo obvious, that Mr. *Innes* dares never repete them fairly, but always gloſſes them ſo as they may beſt ſerve his Scheme, *viz.* "*Fergus* Son of *Erc* "was the firſt King of the *Scottiſh* Race," or, "*Fergus* Son "of *Erc* was the firſt King of the *Scots* in *Britain*;" which every body ſees differs vaſtly from the Words in the Extracts.

However, it is not ſo much to be wondred at, that he finds it in theſe Extracts, when he has found it in *Fordon*. How comes it that he did not diſcover it in Sir *George Mackenzie*'s *Defence of the Antiquity of the Royal Line*?

After all, though it may ſeem a ſtrange Paradox, (let me be allowed to copy after Mr. *Innes*) I will venture to ſay, that Mr. *Innes* himſelf is ſatisfied that the Expreſſions in theſe Extracts to which he refers, do admit of a Senſe conſiſtent with the received Opinion of a Monarchy much more ancient than the fifth or ſixth Age.

This will appear from what he has ſaid in the 4th Chapter, containing the Concluſion of the firſt Section.

He writes thus *p.* 397. "But as to the Antiquity of the "Settlement of the *Scots* in *Britain*, and an ancient Mo-"narchy, even in the *Scottiſh* Line, laying aſide the Addi-"tions of *Boece* and *Buchanan*, I was long of Opinion,

" that on Suppoſition of the Truth of the *Iriſh* high Anti-
" quities, thoſe of the *Scots* in *Britain* might be much more
" probably ſuſtained on the old Syſtem of our Hiſtory, ſuch
" as *Fordon* and his Continuators have left it; the few Par-
" ticulars they contain of the *Scots* from *Fergus* I. till *Fer-*
" *gus* II. laying aſide ſome Things viſibly fabulous, appear-
" ing to me leſs oppoſite to the ancient *Roman* and *Britiſh*
" Hiſtories."

p. 398. " Being unwilling wholly to abandon a Syſtem of
" our Antiquities, which had been generally received among
" the *Scots* during the three laſt Centuries and upwards, I
" was reſolved to leave nothing untried that was conſiſtent
" with Truth, and might gratify my Countrymen attached
" to the Antiquity of the Settlement and Monarchy in the
" *Scottiſh* Line.

" In order to this, my firſt Application was, to ſupport
" the Syſtem of our Antiquities much on the ſame Footing
" on which *Fordon*'s Followers and Continuators had left
" them, before *Boece*'s Hiſtory appeared, by endeavouring,
" *&c.*"

Towards the End of the ſame Page he ſays, " I had entred
" into a full Diſcuſſion of all the Paſſages of the *Roman* and
" *Britiſh* Writers, from the firſt Time that the Name of *Scots*
" is made mention of by ancient Authors; and had ſhewn,
" at leaſt with Probability, againſt *Cambden*, *Uſher* and o-
" thers, that all theſe Paſſages might be reconciled with *For-*
" *don*'s Syſtem of our Antiquities, (admitting ſome Corre-
" ctions of it) and in particular with the Settlement of the
" *Scots* before the *Romans* firſt Entry into this Iſland, with
" their being forced out of *Britain* by the *Romans* after the
" middle of the fourth Century, with their Reſtoration in
" the Beginning of the fifth, *&c.*".

Though Mr. *Innes* is unwilling to ſpeak out as to the Ex-
tracts of the Records of our ancient Hiſtories, yet is it not
plain, that while he inclined to come into *Fordon*'s Scheme,

he

he ſaw how the Paſſages in theſe Records might be eaſily reconciled with the received Opinion of an ancient Monarchy, *viz.* by underſtanding what is ſaid of *Fergus* Son of *Erc*, not as if the Meaning was, that he was abſolutely the firſt King of the *Scots* in *Britain*, but only the firſt after the Reſtoration of the Monarchy?

And one will be apt to think, that the circumſtantiated Account he gives *p.* 744, 745. of the Way that *Fordon* ſeems to have argued or reaſoned with himſelf, in order to reconcile his Syſtem of the forty five Kings with the Remains of the ancient Chronicles of the *Scots*, is the Way that he himſelf has reaſoned while he was applying himſelf to ſupport the Syſtem of our Antiquities.

When I conſider Mr. *Innes*'s wavering and uncertain Way of writing in his Eſſay, it brings to my mind *Horace*'s Carpenter *(a)*, doubting ſome Time with himſelf what Uſe he ſhould make of the Trunk of a Fig-tree he had by him; whether he ſhould make it into a Bench for People to ſit upon, or into a God for them to worſhip, for he thought it might ſerve for either; at laſt he reſolved to make it into a God. I cannot forbear fancying, and I think abundance of Paſſages in his Eſſay will juſtify it, that Mr. *Innes* has doubted a long Time to what Uſe he ſhould put the Materials he had collected; whether he ſhould employ them to prove the Antiquity of the Settlement and Monarchy of the *Scots*, or, on the contrary, to overthrow it; and that it was not without ſome Struggle that he had choſen the laſt.

Indeed after he had determined himſelf, he has urged his Opinion (to uſe Biſhop *Atterbury*'s Words *(b)* on another Occaſion) with ſo much Warmth and Gravity, and ſuch an Air of Aſſurance, that even a wary Reader would be apt to think it well founded. But after weighing the Strength of his

(*a*) 1 Serm. 8. 1 & ſeqq.
(*b*) In the Preface to his Diſcourſes.

his Arguments, I may pronounce, as the Biſhop does of his Adverſary's Cenſure, that never was an Aſſertion (for ought he has ſaid to ſupport it) more raſhly vain, or more entirely deſtitute of all Colour of Truth.

FINIS.